1	ADAM PAUL LAXALT	
$_2$	Attorney General VIVIENNE RAKOWSKY	
	Deputy Attorney General	
3	Nevada Bar No. 009160 555 E. Washington Avenue	
4	Suite 3900	
5	Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 (702) 486-3103	
6	(702) 486-3416 (fax)	
7	VRakowsky@ag.nv.gov PETER KEEGAN	
8	Deputy Attorney General Nevada Bar No. 12237	
9	100 N. Carson Street	
_	Carson City, Nevada 89701 (775) 684-1153	
10	(775) 684-1156 (fax)	
11	PKeegan@ag.nv.gov Attorneys State Defendants	
12	Throrneys Brate Defendams	
13		
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
15	DISTRICT	OF NEVADA
15 16	DISTRICT (HELEN ARMSTRONG,	OF NEVADA Case No. 2:17-cv-02528-APG-CWH
16	HELEN ARMSTRONG,	
16 17	HELEN ARMSTRONG, Plaintiff(s), vs. TERRY REYNOLDS, in his individual capacity	
16 17 18	HELEN ARMSTRONG, Plaintiff(s), vs. TERRY REYNOLDS, in his individual capacity and as Deputy Director of Nevada Department of Business and Industry; STEVE GEORGE, in his individual capacity and as an Administrator	
16 17 18 19	HELEN ARMSTRONG, Plaintiff(s), vs. TERRY REYNOLDS, in his individual capacity and as Deputy Director of Nevada Department of Business and Industry; STEVE GEORGE, in his individual capacity and as an Administrator of the Nevada Division of Industrial Relations;	Case No. 2:17-cv-02528-APG-CWH
16 17 18 19 20	HELEN ARMSTRONG, Plaintiff(s), vs. TERRY REYNOLDS, in his individual capacity and as Deputy Director of Nevada Department of Business and Industry; STEVE GEORGE, in his individual capacity and as an Administrator of the Nevada Division of Industrial Relations; JESS LANKFORD, in his individual capacity and as Chief Administrative Officer of Nevada	Case No. 2:17-cv-02528-APG-CWH
16 17 18 19 20 21	HELEN ARMSTRONG, Plaintiff(s), vs. TERRY REYNOLDS, in his individual capacity and as Deputy Director of Nevada Department of Business and Industry; STEVE GEORGE, in his individual capacity and as an Administrator of the Nevada Division of Industrial Relations; JESS LANKFORD, in his individual capacity and as Chief Administrative Officer of Nevada OSHA; and LARA PELLEGRINI, in her individual capacity and as Whistleblower Chief	Case No. 2:17-cv-02528-APG-CWH
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	HELEN ARMSTRONG, Plaintiff(s), vs. TERRY REYNOLDS, in his individual capacity and as Deputy Director of Nevada Department of Business and Industry; STEVE GEORGE, in his individual capacity and as an Administrator of the Nevada Division of Industrial Relations; JESS LANKFORD, in his individual capacity and as Chief Administrative Officer of Nevada OSHA; and LARA PELLEGRINI, in her individual capacity and as Whistleblower Chief Investigator of Nevada OSHA; DOES I through X, unknown individuals, and ROES XI through	Case No. 2:17-cv-02528-APG-CWH
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	HELEN ARMSTRONG, Plaintiff(s), vs. TERRY REYNOLDS, in his individual capacity and as Deputy Director of Nevada Department of Business and Industry; STEVE GEORGE, in his individual capacity and as an Administrator of the Nevada Division of Industrial Relations; JESS LANKFORD, in his individual capacity and as Chief Administrative Officer of Nevada OSHA; and LARA PELLEGRINI, in her individual capacity and as Whistleblower Chief Investigator of Nevada OSHA; DOES I through X, unknown individuals, and ROES XI through XX, entities, government agencies, corporations, or other companies and/or businesses currently	Case No. 2:17-cv-02528-APG-CWH
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	HELEN ARMSTRONG, Plaintiff(s), vs. TERRY REYNOLDS, in his individual capacity and as Deputy Director of Nevada Department of Business and Industry; STEVE GEORGE, in his individual capacity and as an Administrator of the Nevada Division of Industrial Relations; JESS LANKFORD, in his individual capacity and as Chief Administrative Officer of Nevada OSHA; and LARA PELLEGRINI, in her individual capacity and as Whistleblower Chief Investigator of Nevada OSHA; DOES I through X, unknown individuals, and ROES XI through XX, entities, government agencies, corporations, or other companies and/or businesses currently unknown,	Case No. 2:17-cv-02528-APG-CWH
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	HELEN ARMSTRONG, Plaintiff(s), vs. TERRY REYNOLDS, in his individual capacity and as Deputy Director of Nevada Department of Business and Industry; STEVE GEORGE, in his individual capacity and as an Administrator of the Nevada Division of Industrial Relations; JESS LANKFORD, in his individual capacity and as Chief Administrative Officer of Nevada OSHA; and LARA PELLEGRINI, in her individual capacity and as Whistleblower Chief Investigator of Nevada OSHA; DOES I through X, unknown individuals, and ROES XI through XX, entities, government agencies, corporations, or other companies and/or businesses currently unknown, Defendant(s).	Case No. 2:17-cv-02528-APG-CWH

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and between DEFENDANTS TERRY REYNOLDS, Deputy Director of Nevada Department of Business and Industry; STEVE GEORGE. Administrator of the Nevada Division of Industrial Relations; JESS LANKFORD, Chief Administrative Officer of Nevada OSHA; and LARA PELLEGRINI, Whistleblower Chief Investigator of Nevada OSHA (collectively the "State Defendants"), by and through counsel, Adam Paul Laxalt, Attorney General, Deputy Attorney General Vivienne Rakowsky, Deputy Attorney General Peter Keegan, and PLAINTIFF HELEN ARMSTRONG, by and through counsel, Joel F. Hansen of Cooper Levenson, P.A., that:

- 1) If Plaintiff's Leave to File Amended Complaint (ECF No. 45) is not granted, the Parties agree that the State Defendants' Reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Complaint (ECF No. 44) will not be due until 30 days after the Court files its Order denying Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File Amended Complaint (ECF No. 45);
- 2) If Plaintiff's Leave to File Amended Complaint (ECF No. 45) is granted, the Parties agree that the State Defendants' response to the Amended Complaint will not be due until 30 days after the Amended Complaint is filed.
- 3) If Plaintiff's Leave to File Amended Complaint (ECF No. 45) is granted and State Defendants file a Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint, the Parties agree that the Plaintiff will have 30 days to respond after a Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint is filed.

23

24

25

26

2728

Good causes exists to extend the date for the Defendants' brief in Reply to Plaintiffs Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 44) pending the outcome of the Plaintiffs Motion for leave to file an amended Complaint. (ECF No.45). If this Court grants the Plaintiff's Motion for Leave, the Amended Complaint would supersede the original Complaint and the Defendants would need adequate time to respond to the Amended Complaint.

This Stipulation is entered into this 1st day of February, 2018.

COOPER LEVENSON, P.A.

/s/ Joel F. Hansen

JOEL F. HANSEN, ESQ.

Nevada Bar No.: 1876 1835 Village Center Circle Las Vegas, Nevada 89134

4 (702) 366-1125

Attorneys for Plaintiff

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 2, 2018,

ADAM PAUL LAXALT, Attorney General

/s/ Vivienne Rakowsky

VIVENNE RAKOWSKY, DAG

Nevada Bar No.: 009160 555 E. Washington Avenue, Suite 3900 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 (702) 486-3103

Attorneys for Defendants

ORDER

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE